MINUTES OF THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING TUESDAY- -FEBRUARY 7, 2006- -7:30 P.M.

Mayor Johnson convened the Regular Meeting at 8:57 p.m.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, deHaan, Gilmore,

Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

AGENDA CHANGES

None.

PROCLAMATIONS, SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

 $(\underline{06-058})$ Proclamation declaring January 30, 2006 through April 4, $2\overline{006}$ as A Season for Nonviolence.

Mayor Johnson read the proclamation and requested staff to forward the proclamation to the New Parent Support Group and Alameda Collaborative for Children, Youth & Families.

 $(\underline{06-059})$ Presentation by the Port of Oakland on the draft 20-year Master Plan for the Oakland Airport.

Steve Grossman, Director of Aviation, provided a brief report on the Master Plan study, and Doug Mansel, Project Manager, provided a Power Point presentation.

Mayor Johnson thanked Mr. Grossman and Mr. Mansel for the presentation; recognized Dave Needle with the Airport Operations Committee; expressed thanks to the Port Executive Director and the Board of Commissioners for working with the community; stated she was impressed with the projected cargo traffic reductions.

Melody Marr, Alameda Chamber of Commerce, thanked the Port of Oakland for including the community in the process.

Councilmember Matarrese thanked the Port of Oakland and members of the community who participated in the work sessions; stated he appreciates throttling back the noisiest operations; he is concerned with the accident prone general aviation which ends up over Bay Farm Island and the east end of the Island; he hopes that Alameda's and San Leandro's weight exceeds the other nine Bay Area counties regarding the full 2025 projection; he does not want to sacrifice Alameda's safety or comfort for others convenience.

Councilmember Daysog stated that the City should be proud of the knowledgeable residents involved with the Airport Operating Committee; the progress has been positive.

Mayor Johnson stated that resident knowledge has been extensive.

Councilmember deHaan inquired when regional dialogue would commence regarding the other runways.

Mr. Grossman responded preliminary discussions have been initiated with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Regional Airport Planning Committee; the work should start within the year and continue to be a multi-year process.

Councilmember deHaan stated Alameda's voice is important throughout the process.

(06-060) Library project update.

The Project Manager gave a brief update.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether branch library hours would cover the Main Library hours during the closure.

The Acting Library Director stated covering the hours was not feasible because extra staff was needed for the tagging process; the public would be advised on the closure through a major press release along with a notice from the schools; staff could review the matter again.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether collections would be tagged on the weekends.

The Acting Library Director responded collections would be tagged six days a week at the Main Library; the branch library collections would be tagged on the existing closed days [Friday and Sunday].

Mayor Johnson inquired whether the branch library collections would be tagged in two days.

The Acting Library Director responded in the negative; stated the branch library tagging will not start at this time; the two-week process would concentrate on the Main Library.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether high school students or temporary staffing could help with the tagging process.

The Acting Library Director responded in the negative; stated the Regular Meeting

process is quiet involved.

Councilmember Daysog stated a plan seems to be in place for the transition.

Vice Mayor Gilmore stated that she understands the desire to keep one of the branch libraries open full time; the branch libraries are small and would not accommodate the number of people who use the interim Main Library; she is not sure of the additional benefit in opening a branch library for seven days.

The Acting Library Director stated that extended hours are being planned for the branch libraries during the closure in October.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired what are the closure days, to which the Acting Library Director responded March 6 through March 19.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether the closure could be in the summer.

The Acting Library Director responded in the negative; stated summer closure would not provide enough time for tagging and would impact the summer reading programs.

Mayor Johnson inquired how much time is needed for the tagging.

The Acting Library Director responded that two-thirds to threequarters would be completed during the closure.

Mayor Johnson inquired when the process would be completed, to which the Acting Library Director responded hopefully October.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether the school schedule would be affected.

The Acting Library Director responded in the negative; stated Donna Fletcher, Alameda Unified School District, advised her that the proposed closure dates are the best time to perform the tagging; the School District is helping to get the word out through a newsletter.

Mayor Johnson requested staff to review the possibility of keeping one of the branch libraries open during the two-week closure of the Main Library if there is a huge outcry over closure.

Vice Mayor Gilmore inquired whether future rains would affect the progress of the project, other than brickwork.

The Project Manager responded rains would affect the exterior brickwork; interior brickwork would be done in lieu of the exterior brickwork; noted the new Main Library will have 75 public use computers instead of the current 12.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether the project is ahead of schedule.

The Project Manager responded the project is slightly ahead of schedule and within budget.

* * *

Councilmember deHaan excused himself from the City Council Meeting at 9:49 p.m. due to a pinched nerve.

* * *

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Johnson announced that the bills for ratification [paragraph no. 06-061] was removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 4. [Absent: Councilmember deHaan - 1.]

[Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(*06-062) Minutes of the Special and Regular City Council Meetings held on January 17, 2006, and Special Joint City Council and Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Authority Meeting held on February 1, 2006. Approved.

(06-063) Ratified bills in the amount of \$5,501,850.82.

Mayor Johnson thanked the Finance Director for the new check register format.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of ratifying the bills in the amount of \$5,501,850.82.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 4. [Absent: Councilmember deHaan - 1.]

 $(\underline{*06-064})$ Resolution No. 13924, "Appointing an Engineer and an Regular Meeting Alameda City Council 4 February 7, 2006

Attorney for Island City Landscaping and Lighting District 84-2." Adopted.

(*06-065) Resolution No. 13925, "Appointing an Engineer and an Attorney for Maintenance Assessment District 01-01 (Marina Cove)." Adopted.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

 $(\underline{06-066})$ Ordinance No. 2946, "Amending the Alameda Municipal Code by Adding Section 2-18 (Alameda Film Commission) to Chapter II (Administration), Establishing an Alameda Film Commission, and Prescribing Membership and Duties of Said Commission." Finally passed.

Councilmember Matarrese stated the Film Commission would help to manage the impacts on the neighborhoods and increase business opportunities.

Councilmember Matarrese moved final passage of the Ordinance.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 4. [Absent: Councilmember deHaan - 1.]

(06-067) <u>Resolution No. 13926</u>, "Supporting Equal Opportunity Access to Community Sports Facilities and Community Sponsored Recreation Programs." Adopted.

The Acting Recreation and Park Director provided a brief report on Assembly Bill 2404.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether Alameda programs are in full compliance, to which the Acting Recreation and Parks Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that adoption of the Resolution would ensure that requirements are met for both City-owned and non-City owned programs and facilities; he is please with the efforts made in advance of the Resolution.

Mayor Johnson requested that the actual policy to be adopted by the Recreation and Park Commission on February 9 be brought back to the Council for review; stated that the Resolution is vague; the policy needs to be consistent with the Resolution and State law; thanked staff for being responsive; stated she is impressed with the plans to move forward with renovation and improvements of three fields.

Vice Mayor Gilmore moved adoption of the Resolution.

Vice Mayor Gilmore stated that the resolution provides non-discriminatory access to fields and times; certain groups have been given the least favorite fields and times in the past; the Resolution would ensure a balance in times and field locations.

Mayor Johnson stated that she appreciates former Councilmember Barbara Kerr originally bringing the matter to the Council's attention.

Councilmember Matarrese seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 4. [Absent: Councilmember deHaan - 1.]

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, NON-AGENDA

None.

COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS (Communications from Council)

 $(\underline{06-068})$ Consideration of Mayor's nomination for appointment to the Economic Development Commission.

Mayor Johnson nominated Lorre Zuppan for appointment to the Economic Development Commission.

 $(\underline{06-069})$ Discussion regarding a resolution calling upon steps to withdraw our Reservists, Coast Guard Units and members of the California National Guard troops from Iraq.

Joseph Woodard, Alameda, quoted 2005 Nobel Prize Playwright Harold Pinter; urged a return of the troops.

Mary Abu-Saba, Alameda Peace Network, stated that Alameda needs the California National Guard back.

Susan Galleymore, Alameda, stated the War has caused a lot of horror and destruction; urged bringing the National Guard home.

Mark Irons, Alameda, urged the Council to place the resolution on the next agenda for discussion.

Sallyanne Monti, Alameda, stated the death rate of the National Guard is 35% higher than other units of service; urged return of the National Guard.

Dorothy Kakimoto, Alameda, stated that the War is robbing social services; urged the return of the National Guard.

Kathryn Neale Manalo, Alameda Chapter, Network of Spiritual Progressives, urged the return of the National Guard.

Pat Flores, Alameda, urged the Council to speak out by passing the resolution.

Noel W. Folsom, Alameda, commended Councilmember Matarrese for bringing the matter to public attention; urged the Council to adopt the resolution.

Carl Helpern, Alameda, stated that he was in support of the resolution; the California National Guard was not intended to be an army operational force and should be brought home.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that Alameda is the appropriate place to address the issue and vindicates the controversial vote that occurred four years; there is a difference between a no-cost conveyance and hundreds of millions of dollars of clean up that cannot be done; the City needs to beg for money from the Corps of Engineers to repair the seawall; Alameda's Marine unit was deployed; the National Guard and Coast Guard deployment directly impact Alameda; requested the Council to place the resolution on the next City Council agenda.

Vice Mayor Gilmore inquired whether the resolution language could be discussed if the Council votes to place the matter on the next agenda, to which the City Attorney responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that he would like to hear comments on the wording of the resolution.

Mayor Johnson stated the Councilmembers could make comments at this time; public comment would be heard when the resolution is brought back; stated that a Senate Hearing addressed concerns with the State levels of the National Guard; the percentage of National Guard troops in Iraq was approximately 40% and is currently down to approximately 30%; the National Guard has a two-year time limit for activation; she supports the resolution with regard to the National Guard; she does not believe that California is prepared to deal with a natural disaster; stated she is a little less comfortable with locally dealing with the troop levels, although spending money in Iraq has an impact on local governments; stated that two resolutions could be proposed.

Councilmember Daysog stated that Alameda is a middle-of-the-road type City; Alameda's comments carries weight on issues of global significance; words should chosen carefully and wisely; the public can be engaged to receive more input on the terms of US policy in

Iraq; kindling should not be thrown on the fire that is already in Washington, D.C. and Sacramento; there is an opportunity to responsibility discuss the matter.

Vice Mayor Gilmore stated that she was impressed with the eloquence of tonight's speakers; urged that the matter be placed on an agenda for action; stated she can see the arguments for bringing the California National Guard home; she is comfortable in supporting the decision; she is less comfortable about inserting herself in the national debate regarding levels of troops, even though personally she is not in favor of having troops in Iraq; she would look forward to having a discussion on the matter and receiving more information from experts before rendering an opinion; two resolutions may be appropriate.

Councilmember Daysog stated several resolutions could be considered.

Vice Mayor Gilmore moved to place the matter on the next City Council agenda.

Mayor Johnson stated that there was some discussion on Assembly Member Hancock's resolution regarding the authority of the Governor and Federal Legislation; she would like to have more information on how the issue relates to the National Guard.

Councilmember Matarrese seconded the motion.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that there is some urgency regarding the matter; he would like to have Alameda's voice heard in getting Assembly Member Hancock's resolution passed; the deficit impacting Alameda is a certainty just like an earthquake on the Hayward fault; the deficit impact has already visited Alameda on the Base.

The City Manager requested clarification on the concept of two resolutions.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that he does not advocate a combination; he would prefer a simple, direct approach.

Councilmember Daysog stated that he would prefer to pursue a more simple resolution which has no reference to situations in Washington, D.C. or Sacramento, but which addresses a statement of belief from Alameda.

Mayor Johnson stated that any Councilmember could bring ideas for discussion; other draft resolutions could be part of the Council packet.

Regular Meeting Alameda City Council February 7, 2006 Vice Mayor Gilmore moved approval of placing the matter on the next agenda.

Councilmember Matarrese seconded the motion, which carried by the following voice vote: Ayes: 4 by consensus/Absent: Councilmember deHaan - 1.

 $(\underline{06-070})$ Councilmember Matarrese stated a number of signs throughout the City may violate the sign ordinance; requested staff to investigate the matter.

The City Manager inquired whether the signs were temporary.

Councilmember Matarrese responded that some of the signs are more permanent than temporary.

ADJOURNMENT

 $(\underline{06-071})$ There being no further business, Mayor Johnson adjourned the meeting at 10:43 p.m. in a moment of silence for Former Mayor Chuck Corica and Coretta Scott King.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING TUESDAY- -FEBRUARY 7, 2006- -5:30 P.M.

Mayor Johnson convened the Special Meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Roll Call - Present: Councilmembers Daysog, deHaan, Gilmore,

Matarrese, and Mayor Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

The Special Meeting was adjourned to Closed Session to consider:

(06-054) Conference with Labor Negotiators - Agency Negotiators: Craig Jory and Human Resources Director; Employee Organizations: Alameda City Employees Association, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and Management and Confidential Employees Association.

(06-055) Conference with Labor Negotiators - Agency Negotiators: Marie Gilmore and Frank Matarrese; Employee: City Attorney.

Following the Closed Session, the Special Meeting was reconvened and Mayor Johnson announced that regarding Alameda City Employees Association, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and Management and Confidential Employees Association, the Council obtained briefing and gave instructions to labor negotiators; regarding the City Attorney, the Council discussed the City Attorney's employment Contract.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mayor Johnson adjourned the Special Meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger City Clerk

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown Act.

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION MEETING TUESDAY- -FEBRUARY 7, 2006- -7:27 P.M.

Mayor/Chair Johnson convened the Special Joint Meeting at 7:45 p.m.

ROLL CALL - Present: Councilmembers/Commissioners Daysog,

deHaan, Gilmore, Matarrese, and

Mayor/Chair Johnson - 5.

Absent: None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor/Chair Johnson announced that the Resolution Amending Resolution No. 98-78 [paragraph no. 06-002CIC] was removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Vice Mayor/Commissioner Gilmore moved approval of the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

Councilmember/Commissioner Matarrese seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5. [Items so enacted or adopted are indicated by an asterisk preceding the paragraph number.]

(*06-056CC/06-001CIC) Minutes of the Special Joint City Council and Community Improvement Commission Meeting held on December 20, 2005. Approved.

 $(\underline{06-002\text{CIC}})$ Resolution No. $\underline{06-139}$, "Amending Resolution No. 98-78 Regarding Commission Bylaws Article II, Section 12 Regarding the Powers and Authority of the General Counsel." Adopted; and

 $(06-002A\ CIC)$ Recommendation to Approve Policy Regarding Hiring Procedures for Special Legal Counsel.

Chair Johnson stated that the changes made to the Bylaws were fine; the policy and resolution have inconsistencies; the policy states that General Counsel is authorized spend up to \$35,000 per matter; the resolution states that matters estimated to cost more than \$35,000 must be brought to the CIC.

Commissioner Daysog inquired whether the policy question was that a matter should still come to the CIC if the matter costs \$25,000 as opposed to \$35,000.

Chair Johnson responded in the negative; stated the policy states that the General Counsel is authorized to spend up to \$35,000 on any matter and then come to the CIC, whether the matter costs

\$200,000 or \$35,000; the resolution is correct in stating that the matter should be brought to the CIC at the earliest convenience if the estimated costs exceeds \$35,0000.

The General Counsel stated the policy was adopted by the Council on September 6; noted Page 2, Item #3 states "Comply with the Community Improvement Commission Policy regarding Procedures for Hiring of Special Legal Counsel."

Chair Johnson stated that the policy and resolution state two different things; ARRA may have the same inconsistency; the intent was that matters be brought to the CIC if estimated outside counsel legal fees are more than \$35,000.

Commissioner deHaan stated the Commission would approve the resolution.

Commissioner Gilmore and Chair Johnson concurred with Commissioner deHaan.

Commissioner Matarrese stated the ground rule should be that the matter comes to the appropriate governing body if the estimate is over \$35,000 but General Counsel can spend up to \$35,000 per matter to initiate the process.

Chair Johnson stated that bullet point 1 [General Counsel is authorized by CIC to spend up to \$35,000 per matter from appropriate project budget without prior CIC approval] should be omitted; the correction should be made to the ARRA policy also.

Commissioner deHaan moved adoption of the resolution and approval of the policy with modification to omit bullet point 1 [General Counsel is authorized by CIC to spend up to \$35,000 per matter from appropriated project budget without prior CIC approval].

Commissioner Matarrese seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote - 5.

AGENDA ITEM

 $(\underline{06-057CC/06-003CIC})$ Recommendation to accept Quarterly Financial Report and approve mid-year budget adjustments, including General Fund reserve policy and infrastructure review.

The Finance Director gave a brief presentation.

The Public Works Director gave a brief update on the December 6,

Special Joint Meeting Alameda City Council and Community Improvement Commission February 7, 2006 2005 allocation and the infrastructure plans.

Mayor Johnson requested that a street resurfacing schedule be provided.

Councilmember deHaan requested that a sidewalk resurfacing schedule be provided.

Vice Mayor Gilmore inquired whether the field renovation included sprinkler systems in addition to drainage, to which the Public Works Director responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Johnson stated that certain trees, such as eucalyptus trees, grow rapidly and pruning of the trees is costly; suggested reviewing the possibility of replacing trees that are too expensive to maintain.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether project timelines would be brought back to the Council, to which the Public Works Director responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan stated that residents have to pay an \$85 permit fee to repair a sidewalk square; inquired whether the fee could be lowered to encourage homeowners to take care of the replacement.

The Public Works Director responded both property owner and City responsibilities are identified when sidewalk inspections are performed; homeowners are given the option of using the City's contractor; in which case, the City would cover the encroachment permit.

Vice Mayor Gilmore inquired what was the outcome of the rubberized sidewalk experiment, and whether the City was contemplating having rubberized sidewalks.

The Public Works Director responded that the feedback has been positive; currently, the City is not doing any rubberized sidewalks; the Council would receive a proposal for installing rubberized sidewalks; a \$90,000 grant would be applied to sidewalks; the intent is to piggyback on the City of Oakland's Contract for rubberized sidewalks.

Councilmember Daysog stated a level of complexity exists in terms of the timing of available dollars; oversight is needed; there are two types of budgeting issues: 1) the two-year budgeting process and midyear adjustments, and 2) dedicating dollars when the reserve

is above the 20% level.

The Public Works Director stated that the City Manager and Finance Director have assurances that the \$2 million is available and is enough to keep the remaining General Reserve funds at 20%.

The City Manager stated that the recalculation of the General Fund Reserve is reviewed every year at mid-year to ensure that the reserve is based on the actuals.

The Fire Chief provided a brief presentation on the \$400,000 for fire station planning and acquisition.

Councilmember Daysog inquired whether new sites are being considered which would adjoin existing residential areas.

The Fire Chief responded all West End fire stations should be reviewed to determine the best way to proceed over the long term.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether the proposed study would be directed to the West End fire stations, to which the Fire Chief responded in the affirmative.

Councilmember deHaan inquired whether procurement was being considered for West End fire stations.

The Fire Chief responded in the negative; stated the priority is Fire Station 3.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether the \$400,000 was for the study and acquisition, to which the Fire Chief responded in the affirmative.

The City Treasurer stated reducing the reserve levels is a serious matter; he is concerned with how the money will be used; a good use would be investing the money in City assets; reserves should be spent on projects that result in a dollar-for-dollar benefit; the Fire Department issues should be addressed during the normal budgeting process; the proposal reduced the reserves from 25% to 20%; stated that he understood that reducing the reserves to 20% was temporary.

The City Auditor stated that money from the reserves should go toward identifiable projects; he takes exception to using reserve funds for a study; questioned why a planning decision needs to be outsourced; stated staff should make decisions; paying for a study is not a prudent way to spend down the reserves.

Councilmember Matarrese stated the Council is not changing the reserve limit policy but is requesting to pull money out of the reserves today because the infrastructure is accruing debt faster than the reserves are accruing benefit; every dollar should be tied to an infrastructure repair; spending money on Fire Station 3 also qualifies because the station is a crumbling asset; money spent on a study is not appropriate; suggested looking for funding in the ARRA planning budget.

Mayor Johnson concurred with Councilmember Matarrese regarding not changing the reserve limit policy; stated money is being allocated to pay for needed projects.

Vice Mayor Gilmore stated that the City has known about fire station issues; there is no immediate urgency except for Fire Station 3; the next budget process can review appropriating money for the study; there are deeper problems if \$20,000 cannot be found in the normal budget process; the reserve reduction should be considered a one-time occurrence; the goal will be to continue to build reserves back up to 25%.

Councilmember Daysog stated that the reserves were built up by not investing in the infrastructure over the years; now is the time to invest back into the sidewalks and streets; inquired what the affect will be on the undesignated reserves.

The Finance Director responded that there are no undesignated reserves; the policy sets a 25% target for economic uncertainties; some portions of the reserves have been loaned to other funds and the cash is not available; \$6 million out of \$18 million has been loaned out; the remaining funds would allow sufficient time to make decisions on how to proceed.

The City Treasurer stated that \$380,000 remains in the pool for planning and acquisition costs after the \$20,000 for the study; questioned why \$380,000 should be taken out of reserves today to put the money into an interest-bearing account for future acquisition.

Councilmember Matarrese stated the funds should be held in abeyance [designated reserve] for Fire Station 3; money would not be allocated [designated] from the reserves for a study, only for acquisition and/or repair.

Councilmember deHaan stated impact funding was set aside; inquired whether the impact funding was earmarked for studies and how the

balance of the fiscal year looked.

The Finance Director responded that the year should end with revenues exceeding expenditures based on what is being done today.

Councilmember deHaan stated there will always be adjustments.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that some of the money allocated in December would be invested in field repair; a turf management plan was discussed earlier in the year; the turf management plan should be accelerated to ensure repairs are not lost after a year of play or a season of rain; the plan should be accelerated to protect the investment.

The Acting Recreation and Park Director stated that the turf management plan has been initiated; solid plans should be in place within the next month.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether the process could be accelerated to have plan in place before investments are made, to which the Acting Recreation and Park Director responded in the affirmative.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether most of the \$1.6 million would go to contractors.

The Public Works Director responded some money would cover costs for design, inspection and contract administration; staff levels cannot cover the physical work; sidewalk inspections are intensive.

Mayor Johnson inquired how much of the \$1.6 million would toward design and contract management.

The Public Works Director responded that design is generally 10% of the construction cost; contract administration and inspections can be 3-5%.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether the design, construction management and inspections would be handled by contractors, to which the Public Works Director responded the tasks would be handled by existing staff.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired why the costs need to be covered if existing staff is used.

The Public Works Director responded the Public Works Engineering division functions like an engineering firm; 80% of the engineering

budget comes from revenues.

Mayor Johnson stated department budgets should not be supplemented by drawing down on reserves; the \$1.6 million should be spent on hard construction projects; 16% of the \$1.6 million would go to the Public Works Department and is an extraordinary expenditure to invest in the City.

The City Manager stated that the process could be reviewed; other projects would need to be contracted out; staff can review the cost of design and contract management in terms of allocation to obtain economy of scale.

Councilmember Matarrese inquired whether additional money would be needed to backfill the other projects.

Councilmember deHaan stated that staff should determine the best resources for the projects; there is an economy of scale to be derived which might not be a full 10% for design; however, the job has to be inspected.

Mayor Johnson stated that part of Council direction could be to have the City Manager review costs with the Public Works Department; she hopes that the costs could be below 16%; the City should not pay flat fees and end up supplementing the Public Works budget.

The City Manager stated some City staff would be dedicated to the projects; more definitive costs will be provided.

Mayor Johnson requested that the budget for the \$1.6 million appropriation come back to Council for review.

Councilmember Matarrese moved approval of allocating the funds from the [General Fund] reserve [\$1.6 million for infrastructure projects and \$400,000 to designated reserve for Fire Station3 acquisition] and accepting the staff report as written with the following conditions: 1) that the City Manager work with the Public Works Department and Fire Department to break down associated costs to execute the outlined tasks [infrastructure and Fire Station 3 projects] including reviewing economy of scale, 2) review ways to protect the renovations and improvements, such as the turf management plan, and 3) that the policy is to maintain a 25% General Fund target level [but allow for a temporary reduction to 20%].

Mayor Johnson requested the motion be clarified for the \$400,000

item.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that the motion is that the \$400,000 would be for acquisition [of Fire Station 3] only, and the study would be addressed during the budget process.

Mayor Johnson inquired whether the \$400,000 would be taken out of the reserves.

Councilmember Matarrese responded that the \$400,000 would still remain in the reserves but would be designated for Fire Station 3 acquisition.

Vice Mayor Gilmore seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Councilmember deHaan stated that he hopes the City Manager would review existing funding sources for the study.

Mayor Johnson stated a fire station needs study for the Base might be premature because the property has not been acquired.

Councilmember Matarrese stated that Fire Station 3 needs to be addressed; the problems at Fire Station 3 are comparable to the worst sidewalk or pothole.

Councilmember deHaan amended the motion to include that Contracts return to the Council for review.

Councilmember Matarrese and Vice Mayor Gilmore agreed to the amended motion.

On the call for the question, the motion carried by unanimous voice vote -5.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor/Chair Johnson adjourned the Special Joint Meeting at 8:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lara Weisiger, City Clerk Secretary, Community Improvement Commission

The agenda for this meeting was posted in accordance with the Brown

Special Joint Meeting Alameda City Council and Community Improvement Commission February 7, 2006